



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,300	06/19/2001	Glenn J. Boysko	53470.003028	9721
21967	7590	09/04/2008	EXAMINER	
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP			NGUYEN, THU HA T	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT				
1900 K STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1200			2153	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/883,300

Filing Date: June 19, 2001

Appellant(s): BOYSKO ET AL.

Microstrategy, Inc.
Brian M. Buroker
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed August 05, 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed January 22, 2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by **Win et al.** (hereinafter Win) U.S. Patent No. **6,453,353**.

2. As to claim 1, Win teaches the invention as claimed, including a method for integrating security and user account data in a reporting system with at least one remote repository comprising the steps of:

enabling a user to submit user credential input to a reporting system (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-40 –*receiving user registers/log-in to the system/central repository/registry repository at a registry server*);

identifying an authentication process (figure 1, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 6);
forwarding the user credential input to a first server (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 8, line 5-col. 10, line 33 –*forwarding to access server 106 for authentication*); and

enabling the first server to apply the authentication process to authenticate the user against a remote repository for verifying the user credential input (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67 –*the access server 106 authenticates/verifies user name/password with Registry sever 108*) and to determine user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64 –*providing user a personalized menu that displays only resources that user has a right to access according to user's profile*,

including user's role and privileges), wherein the remote repository is located within a second server, the second server being different from the first server (figure 1, col. 6, lines 20-26 and 41-54 – the registry repository 110 at the registry server 108 that stores user information, resources, users' role that can be used by access server 106 to authorize user's privileges and wherein the access server 106 and registry server 108 are different).

3. As to claim 2, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising a step of importing user information from the remote repository (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

4. As to claim 3, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (col. 12, lines 10-53).

5. As to claim 4, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises an operating system authentication (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67).

6. As to claim 5, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising a step of enabling the server to synchronize user account data with the user information from the remote repository (col. 7, lines 34-67, col. 19, line 50-col. 20, line 53).

7. As to claim 6, Win teaches wherein the user is associated with a group of users wherein group information from the remote repository is imported (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

8. As to claim 7, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the user information comprises at least one or user permissions, privileges and access rights associated with the user (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64).

9. As to claim 8, Win teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for integrating security and user account data in a reporting system with at least one remote repository, comprising:

an input for enabling a user to submit user credential input to a reporting system (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-40 –*receiving user registers/log-in to the system/central repository*);

an identification module for identifying an authentication process (figure 1, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 6);

a forwarding module for forwarding the user credential input to a first server (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 8, line 5-col. 10, line 33 –*forwarding to access server 106 for authentication*); and

a first server for applying the authentication process to authenticate the user against a remote repository for verifying the user credential input (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67 –*the access server 106 authenticates/verifies user name/password with Registry sever 108*) and to determine user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64 –*providing user a personalized menu that displays only resources that user has a right to access according to user's profile, including user's role and privileges*), wherein the remote repository is located within a second server, the second server being different from the first server (figure 1, col. 6, lines 20-26 and 41-54 – *the registry repository 110 at the registry server 108 that stores user information, resources, users' role that can be used by access server 106 to authorize user's privileges and wherein the access server 106 and registry server 108 are different*).

10. As to claim 9, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising an import module for importing user information from the remote repository (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

11. As to claim 10, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (col. 12, lines 10-53).

12. As to claim 11, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises an operating system authentication (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67).

13. As to claim 12, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the server synchronizes user account data with the user information from the remote repository (col. 7, lines 34-67, col. 19, line 50-col. 20, line 53).

14. As to claim 13, Win teaches wherein the user is associated with a group of users wherein group information from the remote repository is imported (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

15. As to claim 14, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the user information comprises at least one or user permissions, privileges and access rights associated with the user (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64).

16. As to claim 15, Win teaches the invention as claimed, including a processor-readable medium comprising code for execution by a processor to integrate security and user account data in a reporting system with at least one remote repository, the medium comprising:

code for causing a processor to enable a user to submit user credential input to a reporting system (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-40 –*receiving user registers/log-in to the system/central repository*);

code for causing a processor to identify an authentication process (figure 1, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 6);

code for causing a processor to forward the user credential input to a first server (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 8, line 5-col. 10, line 33 –*forwarding to access server 106 for authentication*); and

code for causing a processor to enable the first server to apply the authentication process to authenticate the user against a remote repository for verifying the user credential input (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67 –*the access server 106 authenticates/verifies user name/password with Registry sever 108*) and to determine user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64 –*providing user a personalized menu that displays only resources that user has a right to access according to user's profile, including user's role and privileges*), wherein the remote repository is located within a second server, the second server being different from the first server (figure 1, col. 6, lines 20-26 and 41-54 – *the registry repository 110 at the registry server 108 that stores user information, resources, users' role that can be used by access server 106 to authorize user's privileges and wherein the access server 106 and registry server 108 are different*).

17. As to claim 16, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising code for causing a processor to import user information from the remote repository (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

18. As to claim 17, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the authentication process comprises at least one of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol and operating system authentication (col. 12, lines 10-53).

19. As to claim 18, Win teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising code for causing a processor to enable the server to synchronize user account data with the user information from the remote repository (col. 7, lines 34-67, col. 19, line 50-col. 20, line 53).

20. As to claim 19, Win teaches wherein the user is associated with a group of users wherein group information from the remote repository is imported (figure 1, col. 5, lines 12-20, col. 6, lines 20-26, col. 7, lines 45-57).

21. As to claim 20, Win teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the user information comprises at least one or user permissions, privileges and access rights associated with the user (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64).

(10) Response to Argument

Applicant argues that Win fails to teach at least the limitation directed to “enabling the first server ...to determine user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects, wherein the remote repository is located within a second server, the second server being different from the first server.

In response to applicant’s argument, the examiner submits that Win does teach or suggest enabling the first server to apply the authentication process to authenticate the user against a remote repository for verifying the user credential input (figures 1, 3, 5, col. 6, lines 41-col. 7, line 67 –*the access server 106 authenticates/verifies user name/password with Registry sever 108*) and to determine user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects (abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64 –*providing user a personalized menu that displays only resources that user has a right to access according to user’s profile, including user’s role and privileges*), wherein the remote repository is located within a second server, the second server being different from the first server (figure 1, col. 6, lines 20-26 and 41-54 – *the registry repository 110 at the registry server 108 that stores user information, resources, users’ role that can be used by access server 106 to authorize user’s privileges and wherein the access server 106 and registry server 108 are different*).

Applicant argues that, specifically, Win makes no mention of applying the authentication process against "a remote repository" and "wherein the remote repository is located within a second server". Rather, Win teaches a "Registry server 108 is coupled to a registry repository 110".

In response to Applicant's argument, the examiner submits that when analyzing the enabled scope of a claim, the teachings of the specification must not be ignored because claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation that is consistent with the specification. Therefore, the examiner has given claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

In the specification the applicant discloses the remote repository/database that stores user information and other data use to authenticate against the user login ID and password in order to determine whether the user is allowed to access the server as disclosed in figures 1, 8 and 9 of the instant application. There is clearly shown the databases are coupled to the server. Accordingly, the examiner asserts that Win teaches the registry repository 110 at the registry server 108 that stores user information, resources, users' role that can be used by access server 106 to authorize user's privileges and wherein the access server 106 and registry server 108 are different as shown in figure 1, col. 6, lines 20-26 and 41-54. Therefore, the examiner concludes that Win does teach the remote repository is located within a second server,

the second server being different from the first server as disclosed in the claimed invention.

Applicant argues that Win fails to teach or suggest determining user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects. In response to applicant's argument, the examiner submits that Win does teach the feature of determining user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects as shown in abstract, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 17, col. 8, lines 5-23, col. 11, lines 42-64 (i.e., *providing user a personalized menu that displays only resources that user has a right to access according to user's profile, including user's role and privileges*).

Likewise, independent claims 8 and 15 are computer system and program that disclosed similar limitations as independent claim 1; therefore, they are also rejected for the same reason as discussed in independent claim 1 above.

Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15. Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-20 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims

and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action mailed date January 22, 2008.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/THUHA T. NGUYEN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2153

Conferees:

/Glenton B. Burgess/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2153

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151